

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated April 3, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response extended one month and set to expire on August 3, 2007. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-19 remain pending in the application and are shown above. Claims 1-19 are rejected. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested for reasons presented below.

Claims 1 and 13 are amended to clarify the invention. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, in paragraph [0035] of the specification. These amendments are not presented to distinguish a reference, thus, the claims as amended are entitled to a full range of equivalents if not previously amended to distinguish a reference.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-14, and 16-19

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-14 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Uzoh et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,354,916). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegall Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

In this case, *Uzoh et al.* does not disclose each and every element as set forth in the claim." For example, *Uzoh et al.* does not disclose applying a current to a surface of the substrate in a partial enclosure containing the electrolyte and depositing a material on the substrate while rotating the partial enclosure as recited in amended claim 1 and amended claim 13. *Uzoh et al.* discloses a plating solution composition that is modified to allow the deposition of a high quality copper layer and at the same time allow either simultaneous or sequential polishing and planarization of the deposited layer. (See US 6,354,916 at col. 6, lines 26-29).

As a result, *Uzoh et al.* does not teach, show, or suggest a method of processing a substrate, comprising positioning the substrate in a partial enclosure containing an electrolyte solution, wherein the substrate is positioned a first distance from a permeable disc disposed in the electrolyte, applying a current to a surface of the substrate exposed to the electrolyte and depositing a material on the substrate while rotating the partial enclosure, and positioning the substrate a second distance from the permeable disc, the second distance being less than the first distance as recited in amended claim 1 and claims 2-12 dependent thereon. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Also, *Uzoh et al.* does not teach, show, or suggest a method of processing a substrate comprising positioning the substrate in a partial enclosure containing an electrolyte solution, wherein the substrate is positioned a first distance from a permeable disc disposed in the electrolyte, and applying a current to a surface of the substrate exposed to the electrolyte and depositing a material on the substrate while rotating the partial enclosure as recited in amended claim 13 and claims 14-19 dependent thereon. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 7 and 15

Claims 3, 7 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Uzoh et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,354,916). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. (See MPEP 2143.03, In re Royka, 490 F. 2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA)). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

For the reasons discussed above, *Uzoh et al.* does not teach, show, suggest, or otherwise make obvious a method of processing a substrate comprising positioning the substrate in a partial enclosure containing an electrolyte solution, wherein the substrate is positioned a first distance from a permeable disc disposed in the electrolyte, applying a current to a surface of the substrate exposed to the electrolyte and depositing a material on the substrate while rotating the partial enclosure, and positioning the substrate a second distance from the permeable disc, the second distance being less

than the first distance as recited in amended claim 1 and claims 3 and 7 dependent thereon. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Also, for the reasons discussed above, *Uzoh et al.* does not teach, show, suggest, or otherwise make obvious a method of processing a substrate, comprising positioning the substrate in a partial enclosure containing an electrolyte solution, wherein the substrate is positioned a first distance from a permeable disc disposed in the electrolyte and applying a current to a surface of the substrate exposed to the electrolyte and depositing a material on the substrate while rotating the substrate as recited in amended claim 13 and claim 15 dependent thereon. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 6

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Uzoh et al.* in view of *Taylor et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,210,555). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Taylor et al. discloses a electrochemical method for depositing a metal in small blind holes in a substrate using current that contains pulses that are cathodic with respect to the substrate and pulses that are anodic with respect to the substrate. (See US 6,210,555 at abstract). *Taylor et al.* is silent as to applying a current to a surface of the substrate exposed to the electrolyte and depositing a material on the substrate while rotating the partial enclosure.

As a result, *Uzoh et al.* in view of *Taylor et al.* does not teach, show, suggest, or otherwise make obvious a method of processing a substrate, comprising positioning the substrate in a partial enclosure containing an electrolyte solution, wherein the substrate is positioned a first distance from a permeable disc disposed in the electrolyte, applying a current to a surface of the substrate exposed to the electrolyte and depositing a material on the substrate while rotating the partial enclosure, and positioning the substrate a second distance from the permeable disc, the second distance being less than the first distance as recited in amended claim 1 and claim 6 dependent thereon. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed.

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Keith M. Tackett
Registration No. 32,008
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)